

REMARKS

The Examiner's attention to the present application is noted with appreciation. The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Dunn et al. Such rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly as to the claims as amended. In a telephone conference on May 18, 2006, the Examiner indicated that pending an additional search the claims would be allowable if the limitation that the samples are at the same distance to the opening is added to the claimed invention. Claim 1 has been amended to include such limitation. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification on page 6, lines 13-26, and Fig. 1.


The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, and 10-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanners et al., either alone or in view of other references. Such rejections are respectfully traversed. As agreed in the above-referenced telephone conference, in contrast to the Examiner's Response to Arguments in Section 7 of the Final Office Action, the present claims do require a heater. Thus all required elements are not found in the art cited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection and objection have been avoided and/or traversed. It is believed that the case is now in condition for allowance and same is respectfully requested before the statutory deadline of September 13, 2006.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner believes that prosecution of this application might be expedited by discussion of the issues, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned agent for Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Philip D. Askenazy, Reg. No. 56,721
Direct line (505) 998-6132

Attorneys for Applicant(s)
PEACOCK, MYERS & ADAMS, P.C.
P.O. BOX 26927
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927
Telephone: (505) 998-1500
Facsimile: (505) 243-2542

G:\AMDS\Conductor Analysis\166 OA response after final.doc